

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

LAW OFFICES OF CORY J. HILTON,
 Plaintiff,
 v.
 KARL DINKEL, et al.,
 Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-01151-JCM-NJK

ORDER

[Docket No. 26]

Pending before the Court is the parties' joint proposed discovery plan. Docket No. 26. The Local Rules provide that the discovery plan must state the calendar dates for each deadline within the discovery period. *See* Local Rules 26-1(b). The parties, however, fail to provide any calendar dates and instead provide a generalized timeline for the discovery period. *See* Docket No. 26 at 2. Moreover, the parties propose that all discovery be stayed pending the Court's resolution of the Defendants' pending motions to dismiss. *See* Docket No. 26 at 1. However, there is no pending motion to stay discovery for the Court to consider.¹ *See* Docket.

Accordingly, the parties' proposed amended discovery plan is **DENIED**. Docket No. 26. The parties must file a joint proposed discovery plan that complies with this Court's Local Rules by September 28, 2023.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 21, 2023


 Nancy J. Koppe
 United States Magistrate Judge

¹ In any event, the caselaw in this District is clear that the filing of a potentially meritorious dispositive motion does not, in itself, stay discovery. *See Tradebay, LLC v. eBay, Inc.*, 278 F.R.D. 597, 600 (D. Nev. 2011) ("The federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not provide for automatic or blanket stays of discovery when a potentially dispositive motion is pending.").